

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

**P36504P0-533**

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

**PCT/JP2004/016739**

International filing date (day/month/year)

**11.11.2004**

Priority date (day/month/year)

**13.11.2003**

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

**MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.**

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/016739

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language  
\_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/JP2004/016739

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 2000-13708 A (Hitachi, Ltd.)  
14 January 2000, full text, all drawings

Document 2: JP 11-7453 A (Mitsubishi Electric Corporation)  
12 January 1999, full text, all drawings

Document 3: JP 2002-369090 A (Mitsubishi Electric Corporation)  
11 September 2002, full text, all drawings

Document 4: JP 10-243309 A (Toshiba Corporation)  
11 September 1998, full text, all drawings

Document 5: JP 2002-354356 A (Sharp Corporation)  
06 December 2002, full text, all drawings (Family: none)

Document 6: JP 11-196389 A (K.K. Jisedai Joho Hosyo System Kenkyusho), 21 July 1999,  
full text, all drawings

Document 7: JP 2000-59745 A (K.K. Jisedai Joho Hosyo System Kenkyusho), 25 February  
2000, full text, all drawings

Document 8: JP 2002-320159 A (NEC Corporation)  
31 October 2002, full text, all drawings

Claims 1-9

As the inventions respectively described in claims 1, 8 and 9, the technology such that, for registering a keyword, when the contribution degree of the keyword is written for each category of program contents, and a word included in program information with respect to each program has a match with the registered keyword, the contribution degree is accumulated for each category to calculate a category evaluation value is neither described nor suggested in any of documents 1-8 listed in the ISR.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/016739

Box No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The relationship between the matters described in claim 4 and the matters of the invention relating to claim 2 which claim 4 cites from is unclear.

The said classifying means described in claim 4 is unclear regarding to which means described earlier this corresponds.